

2005 Performance and Progress Report

**State of Idaho
Nonpoint Source Management Program**

January 1 through December 31, 2005

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality



Cover photo: **Sediment pond in the South Fork Cottonwood Creek Watershed.**

2005 Performance and Progress Report



State of Idaho Nonpoint Source Management Program

February 2006



This photo and next: First graders from Moscow, Idaho public schools receive hands-on lessons about water quality protection in this stream bank protection project on Tammany Creek. (Photo provided courtesy of Palouse-Clearwater Environmental Institute.)

Acknowledgments

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) would like to acknowledge the efforts of those who contributed to the development of this report.

Thanks to Mary Rosen (Soil Conservation Commission), Mitch Poulsen (Bear Lake Regional Commission), Eileen Rowan (Soil Conservation Commission), and Bruce Schuld (DEQ) for their contributions to the *Outstanding Projects of 2005* section of the report.

Thanks also to the organizations who participated in the field evaluations:

Ada County Parks and Recreation	Potlatch Corporation, Resource Management Division
Bear Lake Regional Commission	
Franklin County Soil and Water District	Private landowners from across the state
Gem County Soil and Water Conservation District	Snake River Conservation Research Center (Northwest Irrigation and Soils Research Laboratory), University of Idaho
Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts	Snake River Soil and Water Conservation District
Idaho Department of Agriculture	Trout Unlimited
Idaho Department of Lands	University of Idaho Extension Service
Idaho Soil Conservation Commission	Valley Soil and Water Conservation District
Latah Soil and Water Conservation District	Weiser River Soil Conservation District
Lewis Soil Conservation District	Wood River Land Trust
Members of the various Basin Advisory Groups	Yellowstone Soil Conservation District
Natural Resource Conservation Service	
Northwest Natural Resource Group	
Palouse-Clearwater Environmental Institute	
Paradise Cove Homeowners Association	

This page intentionally left blank for correct doubled-side printing.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	v
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	xiv
Glossary.....	xvii
Section 1. 2005 Performance and Progress Report.....	1
Introduction	1
Overview of the Idaho Nonpoint Source Program	1
Scope of the Idaho Nonpoint Source Program	1
Assessing Program Performance	1
Watersheds Provide the Framework of the Program Methodology.....	1
Program Emphasis and Focus	2
Public Participation	2
Providing Technical Support to Projects.....	2
Statewide Program and Project Administration	3
Task 1: State office grant and project management.....	3
Task 2: Develop policies and guidance materials	6
Task 3: Revise existing NPS MOUs	7
Task 4: Annual NPS Monitoring Workshop	7
Task 5: Facilitate discussion on TMDL implementation activities for urban watersheds; provide contractor to coordinate dialogue in the pacific northwest and sponsor statewide conference	8
Task 6: On-ground review of existing nonpoint source projects.....	8
Task 7: Integration of NPS activities into the State Revolving Fund Program	8
Task 8: Statewide technical support, education, and information transfer on TMDL implementation activities with an emphasis on urban watersheds.	8
Task 9: Submit FY2004 Report to Congress to EPA.....	8
Task 10: Coordinate, review, and distribute completed annual report for NPS Program.....	8
Section 2. 2005 Project Field Evaluation Season.....	9
Introduction	9
Field Evaluation Process	9
Results.....	9
Section 3. Outstanding Projects of 2005.....	15
Stibnite Mine Restoration: Glory Hole and Meadow Creek Projects	17
South Fork Cottonwood Creek Watershed Enhancement Project – Phase I	29
Upper Thomas Fork Creek Stream Bank Stabilization Projects	41
Kinsey Corral Relocation and Riparian Fencing Project.....	51

Perrine Coulee Irrigation Return Flow Settling Ponds and Wetlands Projects	55
Section 4. Summary of Projects Closed During 2005	61
Appendix: 2005 Evaluation Reports.....	63
Report Index	113

List of Figures

Figure 1. Active Nonpoint Source Program projects in Idaho.....	4
Figure 2. Locations of 24 nonpoint source projects evaluated during 2005.	10
Figure 3. Approximately 1.5 miles of access road to the Monday Camp Dump was redeveloped for access to the project. The historic roadway was marred by massive slope failures and deeply incised gullies on fill slopes. The road represented a major eroded surface and source for fine sediment delivery.	18
Figure 4. The river cuts through toe of the Monday Camp dump.	19
Figure 5. Monday Camp Waste Dump during stabilization task. Note the track hoe near the center of the picture.	19
Figure 6 Stabilized Monday Camp Dump.....	19
Figure 7. Reclaimed sediment basin alongside of Glory Hole and the public access road was constructed from a top soil borrow source that was developed for the reclamation work in the Meadow Creek Valley.....	20
Figure 8. Bradley Property Timber Project temporary stream crossing prior to reclamation work done under the Glory Hole CWA section 319 Project.....	20
Figure 9. Obliterated Monday Camp Access Road after reclamation of the Monday Camp Dump.	20
Figure 10. (Left) Meadow Creek Stream prior to 2003 plantings. (Right) September 2005, after plantings.	21
Figure 11. (Left) Poorly implemented BMPs prior to this project resulted in continued piping of heavy-metals-ladened tailings. (Right) Top soil backfilling and revegetation stabilized the springs, reduced flows, and curtailed delivery of tailings.	21
Figure 12. Islands were over-excavated one foot below the original surface and then backfilled with a mixture of spent ore, top soil, and compost to an average of one foot above the original surface.	22
Figure 13. The placement of the backfill mixture created an absorbent island of growing material that would capture and retain surface runoff from the interior of the SODA until the moisture could be evapotranspired, significantly reducing surface runoff that had previously caused most of the erosion on the SODA benches.	22
Figure 14. One year after creating the first vegetated islands, lush grassy species and large woody debris hide and shade over 9,000 plantlings of wild roses and lodge pole pines.	22
Figure 15. (Left) Excavated spent ore from storm water ponds and placed as berm. (Right) HDPE liner is placed on compacted tailings above repository.	23
Figure 16. Springs are present at the base of the upper SODA bench (left), which became the site for a five acre wetland development to contain and abate fine sediment production and delivery to the adjoining Meadow Creek channel (right).	24
Figure 17. One year after seeding, approximately fifty per cent of the upland and riparian plantings died from drought and browsing by deer and elk. However, lush grassy species development now hides and shades the remaining plantlings.	24
Figure 18. One year after planting, thick growths of grasses and forbs hide ten-inch willow, alder, and aspen starts.	24
Figure 19. Additional wetland sites were developed on slopes where other springs expressed themselves or where annual surface runoff could be retained by placing top soil in a way that created a dam and sediment basin. The dams were planted with upland species while the bottoms of the sediment basins were planted with wetland and riparian species.	25

Figure 20. (Left) Surface runoff and mass wasting of upper SODA bench is one of the more significant sources for fine sediment production and delivery. (Right) The storm water catchment pond at the composting facility was developed as a wetland to continue to restrict surface water runoff and utilize it to develop a vegetative cover on top of the SODA.....	26
Figure 21. D-8 Caterpillar with apron feed compost spreader applies approximately 0.25 inches (1,800 lbs/acre) of compost to the surface of the re-contoured upper SODA bench. Subsequently a D-3 Caterpillar dozer cross-rippled the bench parallel to the contours to impede overland flows.	27
Figure 22. Constructed armored drain connects wetlands constructed at the composting storm water pond to the wetlands constructed on the lower bench of the SODA	27
Figure 23. Micro-islands were constructed on the re-contoured and composted upper SODA bench slope, spaced at approximately 50-foot centers. The micro-islands were constructed by excavating three cubic yards of spent ore, mixing it with two cubic yards of top soil and compost, and then backfilling the excavation. The micro-islands were then seeded and planted with lodgepole pines and wild roses.....	27
Figure 24. July 9 th , 2005, DEQ Field review of the Cottonwood section 319 – Implementation of BMPs. Left to right: Cliff Tacke, Cottonwood WAG Chairman; Ed Stuiwenga, ISWCD Supervisor; Leon Slichter, ISWCD Supervisor; Jerry West, DEQ; Pete Lane, ISWCD Supervisor; Scott Wasem, ISWCD Supervisor; John Cardwell, DEQ.	35
Figure 25. Cottonwood BMP Implementations (11/04).....	37
Figure 26. Direct Seed reduces runoff and sediment losses from fields due to the amount of residue left on the surface. In the Cottonwood area, there is approximately 10 tons/acre/year of sediment reductions due to direct seed and no-till systems.....	38
Figure 27. Residue remaining in this minimum tillage field is significantly lower than residue rates in direct seed systems. The additional residue in direct seed systems slows runoff waters allowing infiltration into the soil and lowers sediment losses from the fields.....	38
Figure 28. Sediment basins collect sediments and reduce the amount of sediment and nutrients entering streams and other water bodies. This sediment basin is seen completed in the fall (right) and full of water and sediments in the spring (left).....	38
Figure 29. The runoff depicted is typical of summer fallow systems in the Cottonwood area before cooperators converted to direct seed systems. In areas where landowners are not converting to direct seed, some landowners are installing sediment basins to collect sediments.	39
Figure 30. Filter strips, serve to reduce sediment, bacteria, and nutrients entering water bodies. This is accomplished by slowing water velocity, allowing contaminants to settle out of run-off waters.	39
Figure 31. Fencing (left) reduces impacts to stream banks, and direct access to live water allowing streams to recover and pollutant loads to be reduced. The green re-growth along the creek in this photo is one season of re-growth.	39
Figure 32. Culvert crossings provide livestock access to additional pasture areas with minimal impacts to stream banks and creek waters.	39
Figure 33. Sediment Basin two years after installation. Fifteen tons of sediment has been removed each year from this basin.....	40
Figure 34. Corral berms help to contain corral water and manure, allowing pollutants to settle and keeping them from entering the creek.	40
Figure 35 Location of Thomas Fork Creek.....	41
Figure 36. Thomas Fork Watershed.....	43
Figure 37. Segments treated along Thomas Fork on property owned by John Carricaburu.	46
Figure 38. Segment 2 prior to treatment with BMPs.....	47
Figure 39. Segment 2 after treatment with BMPs.....	47
Figure 40. Success of willows planted in July (photo taken one month after planting).....	48

Figure 41. Segment 7 willow plantings after one year.....	48
Figure 42. Segment 11 before treatment with BMPs.....	49
Figure 43. One year after implementation of BMPs, Segment 11.....	49
Figure 44. Corrals built directly on McMullen Creek before cleanup.....	53
Figure 45. Kinsey Corral: old corral site after cleanup.....	53
Figure 46. Kinsey Corral: riparian area after cleanup.....	53
Figure 47. Kinsey Corral: new corrals rebuilt one mile away from McMullen Creek.....	53
Figure 48. Kinsey Corral: another view of the new corrals.....	53
Figure 49. Main Perrine Coulee Wetland (Wetland located in center of photo).....	57
Figure 50. Construction of Main Perrine Coulee Wetland.....	57
Figure 51. Main Perrine Coulee Wetland inlet diversion.....	57
Figure 52. Main Perrine Coulee Wetland inlet settling pond.....	57
Figure 53. Main Perrine Coulee Wetland first water turned in.....	57
Figure 54. Main Perrine Coulee two months after establishment.....	57
Figure 55. Main Perrine Coulee Wetland outlet structure.....	58
Figure 56. Lower Perrine Coulee Wetland construction start up.....	58
Figure 57. Lower Perrine Coulee Wetland construction.....	58
Figure 58. Lower Perrine Coulee Wetland construction.....	58
Figure 59. Lower Perrine Coulee Wetland Inlet from Coulee.....	58
Figure 60. Lower Perrine Coulee Wetland Inlet Structure.....	58
Figure 61. Lower Perrine Wetland Cell.....	59
Figure 62. Wetland Cell with bulrush planting.....	59
Figure 63. Exclusionary fencing is one of the most effective ranch-related BMPs.....	66
Figure 64. At Paradise Cove, well constructed retaining walls keep nutrient-rich sediment out of Cascade Reservoir. The State of Idaho owns and is responsible for a wide buffer strip around all of Cascade Reservoir.....	66
Figure 65. This section of shoreline has not yet been protected and is subject to extensive erosion due to wave action during high water levels.....	66
Figure 66. A good example of stabilized versus non-stabilized shoreline along Cascade Reservoir. Shoreline erosion is a major source of phosphorous and nitrogen in the reservoir.....	66
Figure 67. Approximately 50,000 tons of mine waste was removed from either side of the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River in an area known as the Monday Camp. Most of the material removed was slowly being eroded into the river prior to removal. Mining in this area dates back to the 1930s.....	67
Figure 68. One of the historic mine mill buildings that was preserved during reclamation.....	67
Figure 69. Close-up view of the historic Monday Camp dump. Mining in this area dates back to the 1930s.....	67
Figure 70. After the Monday Camp dump was stabilized, the access road to the site was obliterated.....	67
Figure 71. A portion of a very large reclaimed mine tailings facility at Stibnite mine site known as the Bradley dump.....	69
Figure 72. The same reclaimed mill tailings facility shown in Figure 71. Vegetation is coming in nicely amongst the woody material and rock debris that has been placed on the surface.....	69
Figure 73. This portion of Meadow Creek had to be synthetically lined and channelized to minimize groundwater contamination emanating from the Bradley dump. The drop structure in the center of this photograph is one of several installed in Meadow Creek.....	69

Figure 74. Artificial wetlands created near the top of the Bradley dump.	69
Figure 75. View from the top of the Bradley dump, showing the Meadow Creek channel.....	70
Figures 76. Vegetation is coming in nicely along Meadow Creek. Much of the planting was conducted by Boy Scouts from the Boise area.....	70
Figure 77. Vegetation in the background was planted in earlier years. The gravel in the foreground is part of a hardened crossing installed as part of this current project.	71
Figure 78. This recently installed drop structure is a good example of how work should be done. Note that the structure is 'V-ed' upstream and is anchored into the shoreline for maximum strength during high water. .	71
Figure 79. Vegetation planted by volunteers is doing well after one growing season.	71
Figure 80. This rock barb is doing more harm than good because it is not anchored in the cut bank. It will likely will need to be re-built.	71
Figure 81. This vegetation was planted several years ago and is doing quite well.	72
Figure 82. This rock barb may hold during high water but will need to be re-checked after the next spring runoff.	72
Figure 83. After one year, willows and grassy vegetation are slowly being established.....	73
Figure 84. Woody and grassy vegetation are regaining a foothold since cattle have been excluded and stream bank stabilization has been conducted.	73
Figure 85. This new hard crossing with a drop-down fence confines cattle to a narrow section of Medicine Lodge Creek while protecting the stream bank.	73
Figure 86. Vegetation is coming in nicely and the biodegradable silt fencing is breaking down.....	73
Figure 87. In another year or so, this area will look completely natural with excellent vegetative overhang for shade.	74
Figure 88. Rip-rap is allowing vegetation to become established.....	74
Figure 89. Some of the better work completed on the Lemhi subgrant: two AFOs are segregated from surface water by containment berms that keep storm water out and keep livestock waste contained.	75
Figure 90. This livestock watering facility is located away from flowing surface water.	75
Figure 91. There are still problems associated with work conducted on this rancher's land. The photographs are of the old corral that is located on an intermittent flowing tributary to the Lemhi River. This facility should be obliterated to adequately protect surface water.	76
Figure 92. A decades-old abandoned bridge abutment formerly stood from the foreground of this photograph to a point near the existing bridge. The abutment and a large volume of sediment and debris were situated to the right, behind the old abutment.....	77
Figure 93. Vegetation was planted by student volunteers from Hailey.....	78
Figure 94. All of the vegetation is coming in nicely.....	78
Figure 95. For this subproject and the numerous other subprojects conducted by the Bear Lake Regional Commission along Thomas Fork, re-sloping and the installation of rip-rap creates the foundation for stream bank stabilization.	79
Figure 96. Vegetation quickly covers stream banks once initial stabilization has been completed.	79
Figure 97. In another year, the rip-rap in this photograph will likely be completely concealed by vegetation.....	79
Figure 98. After one year, this section of reclaimed stream bank looks quite natural.....	79
Figure 99. This section used to have a near-vertical bank slope but has been re-sloped and vegetated.	80
Figure 100. Where heavy livestock traffic is a threat, exclusionary fencing and watering gaps were created.....	80
Figure 101. Filter system designed to keep solid debris from clogging the irrigation system.	81
Figure 102. This filter strip will remove most of the sediment before irrigation water is returned to the river.	81
Figure 103. One of fifteen monitor wells in the Weiser nitrogen non-attainment area.	81

Figure 104. The surge irrigation system in this field will automatically allow part of the field to be irrigated at a time, using water more efficiently and reducing water pollution.	81
Figure 105. This settling pond reduces sediment and allows irrigation water to be recirculated to the fields.	82
Figure 106. Surge system control valve.	82
Figure 107. Where space is a premium in prime cropland, settling ponds must be build to conform to existing fields and roads.	82
Figure 108. Through education, farmers are encouraged to maintain filter strips along fields. Filter strips capture sediment as irrigation and storm water leave freshly cultivated fields.	82
Figure 109. PCEI posts information for the public on all section 319 projects they manage.	83
Figure 110. Overview of part of the project area. The blue plastic sleeves shield new plantings from animal browsing.	83
Figure 111. One of three constructed wetlands that treat storm water and irrigation runoff.	83
Figure 112. Vegetation planted by student and Job Corp volunteers (above and below) appears to have a very high survival rate.	83
Figure 113. Volunteers planted thousands of trees and shrubs over a 3,000 foot span of this stream valley.	84
Figure 114. Storm water and irrigation runoff come from a golf course and other fields above this barn. This land is adjacent to and within the University of Idaho campus, Moscow Idaho.	84
Figure 115. Part of the educational aspect of this project involves monitoring domestic wells within the Camas Prairie Nitrate Priority Area.	85
Figure 116. Lance Holloway from the Idaho Department of Agriculture (above and below) is sampling for nitrate in one of numerous domestic wells for this project.	86
Figure 117. Eileen Rowen from the Soil Conservation Commission is conducting soil tests (above and below) to determine the amounts of nutrients and other elements in farm fields.	86
Figure 118. This sediment basin was installed on a 21-acre field with a grain/alfalfa crop rotation. The basin was designed to trap 65% of the sediment load from the field. The sediment load reduction is an estimated 54 tons/year. The banks will be seeded with a low growing, drought tolerant grass, such as crested wheat grass. This will stabilize the banks as well as act as an additional filter.	87
Figure 119. Animal Feeding Operation located in the Bissel Creek area. The owner is going to install an Animal Waste Storage Facility for a feedlot with an approximate capacity of 970 head. The project will consist of two ponds; wastewater will be piped to a small drainage pond above the feedlot that currently drains about 48 acres of rangeland and drains through the feedlot. A pipeline will divert storm water from the upland area underneath the feedlot. A nutrient management plan is also being developed to address current soil conditions and crop uptake to assure that manure is not over applied.	87
Figure 120. Bissel Creek drainage area. The owner is fencing off 30 head of beef cattle from a surface drainage field ditch. The project involves 1,080 feet of fencing on 32.3 acres. This project addresses both sediment and bacteria. Livestock are now prevented from accessing the drain ditch.	88
Figure 121. This project involved the installation of piping and clean-out structures. The land owner piped 330 feet of existing drain ditch to greatly reduce hillside and field erosion. Three clean-out structures were installed to allow trapped sediment and debris from upstream cropland to be removed from the pipe as needed.	88
Figure 122. Livestock have been fenced out of this section of creek and now come to this watering facility.	89
Figure 123. This settling pond was built to capture sediment and nutrients from hundreds of acres of highly erosive cropland in the watershed above.	89
Figure 124. The educational component of this project is very important. The settling pond combined with no-till farming techniques (above and below) result in the capture of tons of pollutants that normally would be discharged to Cottonwood Creek.	90
Figure 125. This relocated livestock feeding operation (above and below) keeps animals out of the creek.	90
Figure 126. Some of the volunteers for this project include kids from a nearby school. These students are learning about the need for shade to lower water temperature.	91

Figure 127. Volunteers are hand digging much of the side channel. They are making an effort to minimize destruction of existing vegetation that will add shade to water.	91
Figure 128. Disturbed marshy areas are being sloped and revegetated. These areas (above and below) will be quickly re-established.	92
Figure 129. Temporary BMPs are being installed to raise the water level for irrigation to allow vegetation to become established.	92
Figure 130. Fish friendly culverts are engineered for adequate flood water capacity.	92
Figure 131. This was the temporary end of the channel at the time of this evaluation. The 5,000 foot long channel project has since been tied back into the Boise River.	92
Figure 132. The Cow Creek watershed (above and below) includes beautiful, rolling but highly erosive farmland.	93
Figure 133. Upon closer inspection, one can see (above and below) the high erosive nature of the wind driven, very fine grained sediment of the Palouse country.	93
Figure 134. A BMP, known locally as a "gully plug," consists of a sediment basin, stand pipe (above), and a conveyance pipe (below). Scores of gully plugs situated in small swales across cultivated Palouse country capture millions of gallons of storm water and associated pollutants. Relatively clean storm water is then conveyed to the foot of the hill via a pipeline, where it is ultimately discharged to streams.	94
Figure 135. The Potlatch River watershed extends to the mountains in the background of this photograph. All of this agricultural land is highly erosive.	95
Figure 136. With 2,500 acres proposed for BMP treatment within the Potlatch River watershed, approximately 5,000 tons/year of sediment could be eliminated. A one-ton reduction in sediment can reduce orthophosphate (H_2PO_4) loads by 14,000 mg and total nitrogen loads by 4,500 mg.	95
Figure 137. Pine Creek is a more heavily timbered tributary to the Potlatch River. In both areas BMPs including conservation tillage practices (i.e., residue management) is a key management practice to reduce erosion from fields and sedimentation of streams.	96
Figure 138. Pine Creek and its tributaries in the foreground drain to the Potlatch River in the background.	96
Figure 139. It is perhaps too early to tell conclusively, but there appears to be no reduction in crop yield by reducing the fertilizer application rate. This field received a reduced rate of application.	97
Figure 140. This field received the normal higher rate of fertilizer application.	98
Figure 141. However, a true test of the effectiveness of the reduced application rate will take more than one growing season. Further evaluations will monitor the crop production rate and the effect on nitrogen levels in ground water.	98
Figure 142 (above and below). What used to be a near vertical unstable head cut has been sloped to a 3 or 4:1 angle and rip-rapped. It does not look very attractive now but will quickly be covered with natural and planted vegetation.	99
Figure 143. The photographs above and below depict grass mats that were purchased from a nearby nursery. The mats were rolled out similar to lawn sod and staked in place.	99
Figure 144. This newly formed bank looks pretty bad now but will soon look much better.	100
Figure 145. The work in the foreground was completed several years ago. The work in the distance was just completed. Note the rock barb near the middle of the photograph, which will deflect strong water currents away from the stream bank.	100
Figure 146. These photographs show a portion of the Clearwater River watershed, which is roughly the size of Rhode Island. The valley on the right is the Breakfast Creek arm of Dworshak reservoir.	101
Figure 147. This logging road will be temporarily closed to vehicular travel until timber in the area is ready for harvest in several decades. Culverts are being removed, and drainage will be rip-rapped to allow for high levels of storm water and spring runoff flows.	102
Figure 148. Things can go wrong on projects as large as this one. Here the subcontractor improperly cut the slopes at a 1:1 angle in highly erosive granitic soils and improperly installed the geofabric. The project manager will	

directly oversee the correction of this problem. The slopes will be recut to an approximate 4:1 slope and the fabric will be properly anchored. This is just one of the many sub-projects within this overall project area. And it was the only problem area we found during our two day long evaluation.	102
Figure 149. This view of the new settling pond and wetland is looking downstream of Hog Creek towards the Weiser River.	103
Figure 150. The dam will need to be inspected frequently to assure that wave action does not jeprodize the integrity of the facility. This gate will allow the pond to be emptied for maintenance purposes.	104
Figure 151. Galloway Canal irrigation inflow gate.	104
Figure 152. This island will function as a nesting area for geese.	104
Figure 153. Main settling pond (above and below).....	105
Figure 154. Control valves will assure flow levels in the ponds and wetlands.....	106
Figure 155. The wetland component of this facility (above and below) will help take up nutrients from irrigation return flow.	106
Figure 156. The plateau area around Rock Creek (shown above and below) is the site of rapid growth. Some small (five to ten acre) ranchettes are situated in sensitive areas where bacteria, nitrogen, phosphorous and other contaminants can easily be introduced to rapidly descending ground water and irrigation return flows. Pollutant bearing ground and surface water can then discharge to Rock Creek. Education of landowners is the key to success.	107
Figure 157. Irrigated pastures and croplands, as shown above and below, are sources for pollution.....	107
Figure 158. Domestic septic systems are another source of pollution. Again, education is the key to success.	108
Figure 159. Shown above is the access/observation stage located atop the Ada County Parks and Recreation building at Barber Park, Boise.....	109
Figure 160. Living rooftops can be built in a variety of ways, but the simplest involves a relatively light system of drainage and filtering components with a thin layer of soil mix (2 to 4 inches), which is installed and planted with drought-tolerant herbaceous vegetation.	109
Figure 161. The green roof.	110
Figure 162. Proven hardy green roof plants are the alpine types and those that can retain a certain amount of moisture within their leaves or bulbs. Other plants known to flourish in areas of high heat, drought, wind, direct sun, and temperature extremes should be particularly adaptable to the sometimes-harsh environment. Preliminary testing indicated that the drought resistant Sedum family of plants would be a good candidate for this project.	110
Figure 163. If left alone, the creek will continue to meander across the old reservoir floor until thousands of tons of sediment is re-deposited downstream in low energy areas along the South Fork of the Palouse River. ...	111
Figure 164. This stump is several feet below the current surface and represents the pre-reservoir land surface.	112
Figure 165. The only way to correct this problem is to bring in sound engineering and heavy equipment.	112
Figure 166. As shown above and below, the subcontractor is implementing carefully engineered plans.	112
Figure 167. Some of the excess sediment is being utilized to create elevated, stabilized campsites for the many campers who come here from the nearby City of Moscow.	112

List of Tables

Table 1. Active NPS projects.	5
Table 2. Active nonpoint source projects that were field evaluated during the summer/fall of 2005.	11
Table 3. Estimated pollutant reductions for South Fork Cottonwood Creek.	30
Table 4. Baseline soil quality data results for South Fork Cottonwood Creek.	32

Table 5. Total project costs for South Fork Cottonwood Creek. 34

Table 6. Kinsey Corral 2005 TSS (mg/L) means and loads (lbs/day). 52

Table 7. Kinsey Corral 2001 TSS (mg/L) means and loads (lbs/day). 52

Table 8. Kinsey Corral *E. coli* Data, MC2. 52

Table 9. Kinsey Corral *E. coli* Data, MC3. 52

Table 10. Main Perrine water quality data. 56

Table 11. Projects completed in fiscal year 2005. 61

This page intentionally left blank for correct doubled-sided printing.

Glossary

AFO	Animal Feeding Operation
BAG	Basin Advisory Group
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAFO	Confined Animal Feeding Operation
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEQ	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
EC	Electrical Conductivity
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
IASCD	Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts
ISWCD	Idaho Soil and Water Conservation District
RUSLE	Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation
SISL	Surface Irrigation Soil Loss
SRF	State Revolving Fund
STEPL	Spreadsheet Tool for Estimating Pollutant Loads
SWCD	Soil and Water Conservation District
TKN	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
WAG	Watershed Advisory Group
WFPS	Water Filled Pore Spaces
WQPA	Water Quality Program for Agriculture

